REMARKS

The final Office Action dated February 28, 2007, regarding the above-identified application, has been carefully considered; and the claim amendments above together with the remarks that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to respond thereto and address all issues raised in that Action. The independent claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over applied art. A number of dependent claims are revised to depend from independent claim 4, and a new set of dependent claims are presented above to provide similar claims dependent from independent claim 5. Several claims are cancelled to reduce issues. Care has been taken to avoid entry of new matter. For example, the new dependent claims are similar to (essentially the same as except for dependency) original claims 9-12.

Claims 4, 5, 9-12 and 15-18 are now pending in this application. For reasons discussed below, it is believed that this case is in condition for allowance. Prompt favorable reconsideration of this amended application is requested.

Anticipation Rejection is Moot

Previous claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Japanese document 2001-66573(A), which apparently is equivalent to U.S. Patent No. 7,088,355, both of which the rejection cited as "Minolta." This rejection should be moot with respect to claim 1 in view of the cancellation of that claim above. The rejection also should be moot with respect to claim 9, because claim 9 now depends from claim 4 and includes the limitations of that independent claim, which was not rejected for anticipation over Minolta.

Pending Claims are Patentable Over the Applied Art

Claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Minolta. Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Minolta in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,518,944 to Doane. These rejections are traversed, for example, on the ground that neither Minolta alone (as modified to reject claims 4 and 5) nor Minolta in combination with Doane would meet all of the requirements of either of the remaining independent claims.

The claims amended above recite features relating to control of display of a still picture and/or a moving picture responsive to a detected amount of stored electric power in relation to certain average power levels. An example, of such control is illustrated in application Fig. 9. As quoted below, the features are derived partially or substantially from the previous version claim 5, although the language of the newly amended versions of claims 4 and 5 may help to more clearly indicate the distinction of those claims over the applied art.

Amended claim 4 recites *inter alia*:

> said control circuit controls said driving circuit to rewrite a still screen by rewriting a pixel display content when said stored power detecting circuit outputs a stored power detection signal indicative of a detected amount of stored electric power not less than the average power required for at least rewriting of a screen of the display unit, and
>
> said control circuit controls the driving circuit so as to rewrite the pixel display content of the display unit repetitively by rewriting the screen continuously to thereby display a moving picture, when said stored power detecting circuit detects a stored power detection signal indicative of a detected amount of stored electric power not less than the average power required to rewrite the screen continuously.

Hence, in claim 4, the control circuit controls the driving circuit to rewrite a still screen when the detected amount of stored electric power not less than the average power required **for at least rewriting of a screen of the display unit**. In addition, the control circuit controls the driving circuit to repetitively rewrite pixel display content by rewriting the screen continuously, to display a moving picture, when the detected amount of stored electric power is not less than the average power required **to rewrite the screen continuously**.

Amended claim 5 recites *inter alia*:

> said driving circuit is stopped to stop rewriting the screen of the display unit when a stored power detection signal having detected an amount of stored electric power not more than the average power required for at least rewriting of a screen of the display unit is output from the stored power detecting circuit;
>
> said driving circuit is controlled to rewrite a still screen so as to rewrite the screen by rewriting a pixel display content when a stored power detection signal indicative of a detected amount of stored electric power not less than the average power required for at least rewriting of a screen of the display unit is output from the stored power detecting circuit; and
>
> said control circuit controls the driving circuit to rewrite a screen of the display unit so as to display a moving picture by rewriting the pixel display content continuously when the stored power detecting circuit detects a stored power detection signal indicative of a detected amount of stored electric power not less than the average power required to rewrite the screen continuously.

In claim 5, the driving circuit is stopped to stop rewriting, when the detected an amount of stored electric power falls to or below (is not more than) the average power required for at least rewriting of a screen of the display unit. As quoted above, this claim also specifies rewriting a pixel display content when the detected amount of stored electric power is not less than the average power required for at least rewriting the screen. Claim 5 further requires that the control circuit controls the driving circuit to rewrite the pixel display content continuously, to display a moving picture, when the detected amount of stored electric power is not less than the average power required to rewrite the screen continuously.

In contradistinction, the two cited documents Minolta and Doane are both directed to an application dedicated to a still picture. It is respectfully submitted that any modification of Minolta alone or in combination with Doane would fail to provide display by still screen display when the detected stored power is not less than **the average power required for at least rewriting** of a screen in combination with providing a moving picture display, when the detected

stored power is not less than the average power **required to rewrite the screen continuously**, as required by both claim 4 and claim 5.

In the rejection of claims 4 and 5 (as well as dependent claims 13, and 14) over Minolta alone, the Examiner recognized that Minolta discloses still screen display and not moving picture display. A general modification to provide moving picture display, as proposed without supporting evidence in the rejection, would still not lead one to the subject matter of the amended claims. For example, there would not be a moving picture display, when the detected stored power is not less than the average power **required to rewrite the screen continuously**, and a still screen display when the detected stored power is not less than the average power **required for at least rewriting** of a screen, as recited in the independent claims.

The addition of Doane would not overcome the above-noted deficiency of the basic modification of Minolta. It is believed that Doane also relates to a still picture display (i.e. "devices that are not required to show moving video images," see column 4, lines 9-19). Hence, Doane would not suggest the modification of Minolta to provide moving pictures, and presumably, that is why the Examiner did not cite Doane on that point. Instead, the rejection cited Doane only for a teaching to use a thin-film solar cell. Addition of a thin-film solar cell to the device of Minolta would still not result in a device that provides a moving picture display, when the detected stored power is not less than the average power **required to rewrite the screen continuously**, and provides a still screen display when the detected stored power is not less than the average power **required for at least rewriting** of a screen, as recited in the independent claims. Hence, the combination of Doane with Minolta would still fail to meet the independent claims and likewise would fail to meet dependent claims that incorporate such limitations from either claim 4 or claim 5.

In summary, neither the modification of Minolta alone nor the combination of Minolta and Doane would meet all of the requirements of either claim 4 or claim 5. To render a claim unpatentable, a combination of references must meet all requirements of the claim. The modification of Minolta alone as well as the combination of Minolta and Doane therefore would not render claim 4 or claim 5 unpatentable; and those claims plus the other claims that depend from 4 or 5 should be patentable over the art applied in the February 28, 2007 Office Action. At least for this reason, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusions

Upon entry of the above claim amendments, claims 4, 5, 9-12 and 15-18 are active in this application. As discussed above, the anticipation rejection is moot and the remaining claims patentably distinguish over the art applied in the latest Office Action. Hence, the latest rejections should be overcome, and all of pending claims should be novel and patentable. Applicants therefore submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this case should now be ready to pass to issue; and Applicants respectfully request a prompt favorable reconsideration of this matter.

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the February 28, 2007 Office Action. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in an interview or by an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Keith E. George
Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8603 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 30, 2007

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as our correspondence address.